

ley bill relative to the ownership of any line of transportation or common carrier; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of W. S. Salloday and 6 other merchants, of Tatoskola, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Levi Polings; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of D. Boosing, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation adopting a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Utah, protesting against H. R. 4653, relative to pure drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Oakland (Cal.) Rotary Club, favoring the passage of a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the bill relating to granting the Hetch-Hetchy sources of water supply to the city of San Francisco; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of the Boston Automobile Association, favoring the passage of H. R. 4322, for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Hines, late of Company C, Seventy-eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 6198) granting an increase of pension to Willis S. Mahon; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, June 21, 1913.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday last, when, on request of Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

REUNION CELEBRATION AT GETTYSBURG, PA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg Commission request the honor of the presence of the Members of the Senate of the United States at the reunion celebration at Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913.

The favor of an answer, not later than June 20, 1913, is requested to Lieut. Col. Lewis E. Beltier, secretary Pennsylvania commission, Capitol, Harrisburg, Pa.

JOHN K. TENER,
Governor of Pennsylvania.
J. M. SCHOONMAKER,

Chairman Fiftieth Anniversary Battle of Gettysburg Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would ask the Senate what action is to be taken with reference to the invitation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania touching the attendance of Members of the Senate at the Gettysburg reunion. For the information of the Senate the Chair will state that the House of Representatives has accepted the invitation and appointed a committee of 20 Members.

Mr. NELSON. I move that the matter be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is moved by the Senator from Minnesota—

Mr. KERN. I hope the Senator will not press the motion.

Mr. NELSON. I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. KERN. I was about to move that the invitation be accepted by the Senate—

Mr. NELSON. Very well; that is a great deal better than referring it to the committee.

Mr. KERN. And that the Vice President appoint a committee of eight to represent the Senate on the occasion.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I second that motion.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am not, of course, opposed to the motion. I think it very appropriate that it should be adopted, but in connection with it I want to call the attention of

the Senate, particularly of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to a statement that appears this morning in the daily press, purporting to come from the Secretary of War, in which he calls attention to the fact that the money appropriated for the purpose of caring for the soldiers who will come to the reunion at Gettysburg is not sufficient to meet what he thinks will be the demand, owing to the large number of soldiers who will visit there.

It strikes me, Mr. President, that the number expected is 50,000, although I looked at it hurriedly, and that the Secretary is not prepared to care for that number of soldiers of the two armies who were engaged in that battle or who are survivors of the war; that he will not have money enough to take care of them.

It seems to me that it is rather a serious proposition coming as it does at the very hottest season of the year, and that we ought to make no mistake but see that proper preparation is made there for caring for the large number of old soldiers who will probably be in attendance. On account of the time of the year, if there is liable to be any overcrowding, it may result in a great deal of discomfort and perhaps in a good many deaths if proper preparation is not made.

I should like to suggest that if we do not have money enough appropriated to meet what will be the proper demands of the old soldiers there, we ought to give proper authority to the Secretary of War by an appropriate resolution to meet any emergency that might arise.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I did not notice the article in the newspapers to which the Senator referred, and I have received no communication from the War Department with reference to this matter. I am without any information on the subject. I can only say to the Senator that the Committee on Appropriations will look into the matter immediately, and I am sure the committee will give it prompt attention.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator does not imagine that I supposed he would not give it proper attention.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I desire to state that the amount appropriated is entirely in charge of the State of Pennsylvania. My recollection is that the State of Pennsylvania appropriated \$250,000 and requested an appropriation on the part of Congress of \$150,000, which we promptly appropriated. I think it was the idea of the Secretary of War to call the attention of the State of Pennsylvania to the fact that there might not be enough tents. The State of Pennsylvania has the matter in charge and not the Government, as I understand it.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is rather a joint responsibility, is it not?

Mr. OVERMAN. No; I do not think so. I do not think anybody is connected with it on the part of the Government except the Secretary of War, who is charged with furnishing the tents, and so on, in joint action with the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have the Secretary of War equipped with sufficient means to meet any emergency.

Mr. OVERMAN. I suppose if the Secretary of War needed more money he would have sent an estimate to the Committee on Appropriations. He has not done so. Therefore I take it for granted that the \$250,000 the State of Pennsylvania appropriated and the \$150,000 Congress appropriated will be amply sufficient. I presume the only thing the Secretary of War is doing is calling our attention to the fact that there are not sufficient tents on hand. I take it there will be enough tents provided.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I wish to state to the Senator from Nebraska that I as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs received a communication from the Secretary of War this morning stating that there would be a deficit and asking Congress to consider it. I am sure he did not refer entirely to what Pennsylvania has done to take care of the increased attendance of veterans that it now appears will be there.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, I think the article which appeared in the press this morning indicated that the committee in charge of the arrangements was to receive tents from the War Department on the basis of an attendance of 40,000, and this was in accordance with the provision made by Congress. But since that time invitations have gone out for enlarged numbers, so that the arrangements will require tents for 50,000. That is where the alleged deficiency arises, as the War Department under the appropriation could furnish tents to supply only 40,000.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator is right. I am glad to hear the statement of the Senator from Alabama. I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will give the matter prompt consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] to the fact that the resolution passed in the other House, House resolution 179, provides that the expenses of the committee appointed by the House shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives. Therefore, if the expenses of the committee appointed by the Senate are to be paid, some provision should be included in this motion. Of course, in order to do that it will have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That will not take long.

Mr. SMOOT. It will take only a very few minutes to report it back from the committee. I think if the House committee's expenses are to be paid out of the House contingent fund the Senate committee's expenses ought to be paid out of the contingent expenses of the Senate.

Mr. KERN. I will submit a resolution to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana moves that the Senate accept the invitation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to attend the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, that a committee of eight Senators be appointed by the Chair to represent the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. May I have the attention of the Senator from Indiana? It will be remembered that the House resolution provided that the Speaker should be a member of the committee. I suggest to the Senator from Indiana that he modify his motion so that the Vice President will be a member of the committee of the Senate.

Mr. KERN. I am very glad to make the motion that way. I move that a committee of eight Senators be appointed, of which the Vice President shall be chairman.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would inquire whether that is compulsory.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas and others. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KERN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 115), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the invitation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg Commission extended to the Senate of the United States to attend the reunion celebration at Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913, be accepted by the Senate.

That a committee, consisting of the Vice President of the United States and eight Senators, to be named by him, be appointed to attend said reunion celebration on behalf of the Senate of the United States, and that the necessary expenses of said committee be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the Vice President.

Mr. WILLIAMS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

VALORIZATION OF COFFEE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 29th ultimo, information having specific reference to certain litigation in New York in respect to valorized coffee.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have the communication read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the communication.

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1913.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to reply to a resolution of the Senate, dated May 29, 1913, having specific reference to certain litigation in New York in respect to valorized coffee.

In a communication to you, dated May 6, 1913, so far as seemed compatible with the public interest, I endeavored to comply with the resolution of the Senate dated April 21, 1913, on this general subject. A large number of papers—principally the originals—relating to the matter in question were sent to you at that time, and in reference to them I said:

"These are all the material papers on file in the department relating to the subject matter of the resolution, except the correspondence between this department and the State Department, and by direction of the President I beg to say that, in my opinion, it is not compatible with the public interest to transmit to the Senate copies of said correspondence."

Among the papers transmitted was file No. 186½ of this department, dated April 16, which contains the following language touching the disposal of the coffee once held in New York:

"Good-faith assurances have been presented by the Brazilian Government that the understanding was fulfilled in letter and spirit, and the entire amount of coffee disposed of to 80 dealers in 20 States. These assurances are accepted."

The fifth paragraph of the resolution of April 21, 1913, asked "the names and addresses of the parties purchasing the coffee involved in said suit, together with the price and the amount purchased by each." Answering this categorically, allow me to say that I do not know and have never known the names or addresses of the parties who purchased the coffee, or the price paid, or the amount purchased by any of them.

As to "what assurances have been given concerning the alleged sale of said coffee, by whom given, and, if in writing, that copies thereof be sent to the Senate," permit me to say: I received assurance from the State Department that representations had been made to it by the Brazilian Government, the good faith of which it accepted, to the effect that the coffee in question had been sold to many bona fide purchasers in different States. This assurance to me was in writing, but, as stated to you in my former letter, "in my opinion it is not compatible with the public interest to transmit to the Senate copies of the said correspondence."

Very respectfully, yours,

J. C. McREYNOLDS,
Attorney General.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think in the Attorney General's reply he has very frankly stated what it seemed to me he ought to have stated in the prior communication; that is, that he did not have in his possession and never did have the names of the purchasers or alleged purchasers of this coffee, the amount they paid, or the quantity they purchased. There was nothing among the papers which gave any information on this subject, and, as he concedes, nothing from the State Department which gave any information on that particular point.

The agreement by Attorney General Wickersham with the attorney representing the defendant in that suit, Mr. Sielcken, was that he would dismiss the suit if there was a bona fide sale made of the coffee in dispute. The suit was afterwards dismissed by the present Attorney General on the assurance, as he states, that representation had been made to the State Department by the Brazilian Government that the coffee had been actually sold to a vast number of dealers in several different States. It always seemed to me—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I want to inquire if it is not a fact that debate on this matter can not proceed without unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was assuming that unanimous consent had been given. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I shall be compelled to object. The program for to-day does not contemplate a very extended session of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I say the program we have laid out for to-day does not contemplate a very extended session of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that I am going to detain the Senate but a few moments.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Of course, I will not insist, in the face of that statement, that the rule be applied. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to indulge the Senator from Nebraska for a reasonable time.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know to what program the Senator from Arkansas has reference.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It would not interest the Senator at this stage if he knew it.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not understand, then. If the Senator has some secret arrangement—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It is not a secret arrangement, but it is an arrangement that does not include the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I move that the communication of the Attorney General be referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has given assurance that his statement will be very brief.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have not objected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am sure it is one in which every Member of the Senate will be interested, and I hope the Senator may be permitted to finish.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have not objected to the Senator proceeding for a few minutes, as he said he intended to do, but if any extended debate should follow I should, of course, object.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not understand the Senator.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I can not state it any plainer. The Senator from Nebraska has made the statement that he does not intend to occupy the floor more than a few minutes in a mere statement concerning the communication which has just been received from the Attorney General. I have no objection to that, but I thought possibly from the way he started that there was likely to be extended debate on the question.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think so. I will not detain the Senate, in my judgment, to exceed 10 minutes—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I will not object.

Mr. NORRIS. But I believe I am entitled to debate the motion I have made.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; the Senator is not entitled to proceed to debate anything in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is objection, the Chair will rule that the Senator from Nebraska is not in order. If there is no objection, the Senator from Nebraska may proceed. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I would not object to the Senator from Nebraska making a statement not to exceed 10 minutes at the outside. If it is his purpose to limit his remarks to 10 minutes, I would not enter an objection; but he may say something that will induce others to debate the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. My own judgment is that it will not take me 10 minutes. I think, had I not been interrupted, I would have been through by this time. If I am further interrupted, it may take longer. I do not know what may occur, and as I may not be able to get through, I do not want the Senator from Arkansas to take my assurance if he wants to exercise his right of objection.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I think that on some more opportune occasion, when the Judiciary Committee shall have made a report concerning the matter covered by the Attorney General's letter, opportunity will be afforded for debate. I believe I will object, Mr. President. I object.

Mr. NORRIS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NORRIS. Is not my motion to refer the communication to the Judiciary Committee open to debate?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Not in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that during the morning hour the motion is not debatable. The Chair will state, for the information of the Senator from Nebraska, that the Chair rules that the communication from the Attorney General can lie on the table, and the Senator from Nebraska can call it up at the proper time and proceed to discuss it.

Mr. NORRIS. In order to get the parliamentary situation settled for future reference, when it may be desirable to enforce this rule, if it is to be established, I want to inquire in the best of faith if a motion to refer a communication to a committee after the morning hour is debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. Would the Chair kindly state why—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Nebraska be allowed 10 minutes in which to present the motion to refer.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, that is very kind of my colleague, but from what has been said by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] I would rather that the request would not be made. I will be able to take advantage of the parliamentary situation at some other time; but if this is to be the rule I want to find it out. I do not ask for any leniency. If the motion is not debatable, it will save the Senate a great deal of time in the future by having debate shut off on similar motions.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I desire to say to my colleague that it is important for the public business that the session of the Senate to-day be made short; but there is no objection on this side to a 10 minutes' presentation of the case by him and the reference of the matter to the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Arkansas has already objected, I will say. I do not know why it is desirable to make the session short.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is no objection to a 10 minutes' explanation by my colleague.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Record will show that the Senator from Arkansas has formally objected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire the communication referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, or does he desire that it lie on the table?

Mr. NORRIS. If my motion is not debatable, I withdraw it, and ask that the communication lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will lie on the table.

INHABITED ALLEYS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 112).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acknowledging the receipt of the resolution of the Senate of the 17th instant directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish to the Senate the names, residences, and

occupations of all persons owning and renting houses or rooms within what are known and designated as "inhabited alleys" in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes: Irving Holcomb v. United States (S. Doc. No. 111) and Francis M. Magee v. United States (S. Doc. No. 110).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, June 23, 1913, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1917) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BURKE of South Dakota managers at the conference on the part of the House.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 10) of the House of Representatives, which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 23d day of June, 1913, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make them.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate concur in the House resolution just read.

The motion was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1917) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and consent to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. STONE, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. CLAPP conferees on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a communication signed by the professors of the State University of North Dakota, with reference to the proviso in Schedule N of the pending tariff bill. I ask that the body of the communication, including one signature, that of the Hon. Frank L. McVey, president of the university, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Finance, and the body thereof, including one name, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., June 13, 1913.

Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, earnestly request you to use your influence in support of the proviso in Schedule N of the new tariff bill now pending before the United States Senate, as follows:

"Provided, The importation of aligrettes, egret plumes, or so-called osprey plumes, and the feathers, quills, heads, wings, tails, skins, or parts of skins of wild birds, either raw or manufactured and not for scientific or educational purposes, is hereby prohibited; but this provision shall not apply to feathers of domestic fowls of any kind."

Very respectfully,

FRANK L. McVEY
(And others).

Mr. NELSON presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of Sauk Center, Minn., favoring a reduction in the rate of postage on first-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Northern Minnesota Development Association, favoring an appropriation for the construction of drainage ditches, roads, and fire breaks upon those portions of the ceded Chippewa lands still owned by the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ASHURST. On May 29 I introduced a joint resolution, being Senate joint resolution 40, appropriating funds to pay expenses of all those delegates to the conference in this city of landowners and water users under the several reclamation projects. Since introducing that joint resolution I have received a resolution unanimously adopted by the board of governors of the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, remonstrating against the appropriation or use of any part of the reclamation fund for the purposes contained in the joint resolution. I ask that the remonstrance be referred to the Committee on the Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERKINS presented a resolution adopted by the Berkeley Open Forum, of Berkeley, Cal., favoring the enactment of legislation prohibiting the use of the mails by any concern dealing in stock-exchange gambling, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of 4,496 textile overseers and operatives, citizens of Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, New York, and Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed wool and cotton schedules in the pending tariff bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WEEKS presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Leucracia M. Hodge, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1592) granting a pension to Robert Richards, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 2241) granting a pension to Eliza F. Andrews, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

(By request.) A bill (S. 2573) for the relief of the estate of William Stanley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2574) granting an increase of pension to John J. Schneller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 2575) for the relief of the estate of Edward J. Spaulding (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 2576) for the relief of John Q. Adams; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 2577) to regulate the franking privilege; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2578) granting an increase of pension to John How; and

A bill (S. 2579) granting an increase of pension to John J. Porter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2580) regulating the use and occupation of buildings along alleyways in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2581) for the relief of certain enlisted men of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2582) granting a pension to Rudolph Kals; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 2583) to regulate lobbying and the employment and registration of legislative counsel and legislative agents, defining legislative counsel and legislative agents, and prescribing penalties for the violation of the provisions herein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2584) for the relief of James L. Wallace, his heirs or assigns; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 2585) for the relief of Henry B. Freeman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 2586) for the relief of Mollie Quirk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

(By request.) A bill (S. 2587) to provide for the organization of the unemployed into an industrial army of the United States, and the maintenance of same; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 2588) for the relief of Napoleon Le Clerc; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2589) for the relief of Peter McKay; and

A bill (S. 2590) to reimburse Charles C. Crowell for two months' extra pay in lieu of traveling expenses; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2591) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Kuster; and

A bill (S. 2592) granting a pension to Mary A. Tozier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 2593) making an appropriation to increase the salary of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and

A bill (S. 2594) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to deposit funds belonging to Indian tribes in Oklahoma in the banks of said State; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2595) for the relief of the estate of William Kelly;

A bill (S. 2596) for the relief of Katherine A. Smith;

A bill (S. 2597) for the relief of James Jackson; and

A bill (S. 2598) for the relief of Valentine M. C. Silva; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 2599) for the relief of the estate of Augustine McIntyre; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 2600) for the relief of Moses Harris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2601) for the relief of the estate of Napoleon B. McLaughlen and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 2602) for the relief of Mary R. P. Robins; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2603) granting an increase of pension to John Ryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2604) granting an increase of pension to Eva D. Peck (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2605) granting an increase of pension to Laura Garriett (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2606) granting an increase of pension to Celestia A. Beebe (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2607) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) authorizing the delivery to the proper authorities of the city park in the city of Aberdeen, in the State of Washington, two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and suitable outfit of cannon balls; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) authorizing the delivery to the Dan McCook Post, No. 105, Grand Army of the Republic, of one condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpiece and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906 (Stat. L., vol. 34, p. 56); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) for the maintenance, management, protection, and improvement of Platt National Park, Okla. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR.

Mr. WORKS. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the sale, manufacture, and importation of distilled liquor containing alcohol, except for mechanical, scientific, and medicinal purposes under proper regu-

lation by Congress, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the consumption of strong alcoholic liquor is increasing at an alarming rate, thereby undermining the public morals, inflicting disease and untimely death upon many of our citizens, and blighting with degeneracy their posterity, thus threatening the integrity and life of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring), That the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States: After the last article add a new article, as follows:

"ARTICLE XVIII.

"SECTION 1. The sale, manufacture, and importation of distilled liquor containing alcohol, except for mechanical, scientific, and medicinal purposes, under proper regulation by Congress, shall be prohibited in the United States on and after a period of three years next succeeding the ratification of this article by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article."

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have long been convinced that the only way to deal effectually with the liquor traffic is to prohibit the manufacture or importation of intoxicating liquors. But I have realized that such an extreme measure of reform could not be accomplished at one stroke. It would confiscate or destroy the value of too much property and throw too many men out of employment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to call for the regular order of business, but we on this side of the Chamber have reasons for holding a short session of the Senate to-day.

Mr. WORKS. I am going to make only a brief statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we make distinctions at all, every Senator who desires to debate a matter should have equal opportunity. I especially dislike to object when my friend from California is addressing the Senate, but I do call for the regular order.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I was only desiring to make a statement, which will not take five minutes, to accompany the joint resolution which I have introduced. However, if the Senator is willing that I may print this matter in the RECORD—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. WORKS. I will be very glad to accept the suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not only perfectly willing, but will be very glad to have the Senator do that. If we play favorites, it will not do.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, is it proposed by the Senator to print his remarks in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. WORKS. That is what I proposed to do in case there was objection.

Mr. OVERMAN. I prefer that we should not break the old rule which has obtained here for years, and that the Senator should proceed with his remarks rather than that there shall be printed in the RECORD remarks that were not made on the floor of the Senate. I should certainly object to that.

Mr. WORKS. I said to the Senator from Mississippi that what I was about to say would not take five minutes—not so long as the time we have consumed in the discussion of the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I dislike to be put in the attitude of insisting upon the enforcement of a rule and then making an exception for the benefit of one Senator; but, inasmuch as the Senator from California has begun his remarks, I will withdraw my objection to his proceeding. I, however, give notice that I shall insist upon the regular order as soon as he has finished.

Mr. WORKS. I am greatly obliged to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, the joint resolution I now offer affects only the manufacture, sale, and importation of distilled liquors, the most dangerous and life destroying of their kind. This method of reaching this great evil was not devised or first thought of by me. It is the conception of Mr. S. Benson, now a resident of my State, but formerly of Oregon. He has been a large employer of men, and has witnessed the devastating effect of alcoholic liquor on laboring men, especially of the lower grades, destroying their efficiency and often their lives. He is a man of large means, and is devoting a liberal portion of it to the effort to remedy the evil. Objection may be made that this proposed amendment, if adopted, will deprive men of their property and their employment and the Government of part of its revenue. This is to weigh money and property against health, happiness, and life. But considering it from this material point of view its effects will not be nearly so serious as most people would suppose.

Mr. Benson has, at his own expense, employed Mr. E. E. Coovert, an able and competent lawyer, to gather data relating to the manufacture and sale of liquors, capital invested, number of men employed therein, and other information bearing on this important question. Mr. Coovert has performed this service. I have his statement of the facts and figures on the subject. It shows, to begin with, that for the year ending June 30, 1912, 178,249,985 taxable gallons of distilled spirits were produced in the United States, not counting brandy and other liquors produced from fruit, the largest in the history of the country. This, in view of all the efforts made to suppress and curtail the traffic, is a startling, an appalling fact. Out of this the Government has realized the handsome sum of \$146,715,203 on whisky and alcohol and \$2,694,264 on brandy, or a total of \$149,409,467. The showing for the first 10 months of the fiscal year of 1913 is still worse. The increase for that time over 1912 is 6,552,848 gallons, thus increasing the revenue of the Government by \$7,208,133.59 over last year. I know it seems hard to give up this large revenue. But after all it is no better than blood money. The wrecked lives of the victims of strong drink, the widows and orphans it has made, and the crowded prisons and asylums should cry out against this attempt for hire to legalize a business so terrible in its consequences. Besides, if the cost to the Government and the States in prosecuting and caring for criminals, made so by alcoholism, and the paupers and insane that must be cared for as a result of the use of alcoholic drinks were deducted, probably there would be no gain, but a positive loss to the public. Let this be as it may, whatever loss shall accrue to the Government from the taking away of the tax on distilled liquors should be made up by an increased tax on fermented liquors by which it could easily be borne, and I believe would be willingly.

The statement of facts to which I have referred shows a surprisingly small amount of capital invested and number of men employed in the manufacture of distilled liquors. The amount invested in distilleries is only \$72,450,000, while in breweries there is invested in the manufacture of malt liquors \$671,158,000, and in wineries \$27,908,000, making a total investment not affected by this proposed amendment of \$699,006,000. The number of men employed in breweries and the wine industry in 1911 was 54,579, while in distilleries it was only 6,437. There is other interesting data in this statement of Mr. Coovert that I will submit to the Senate in a moment.

It appears that the sacrifice of property and deprivation of employment will be comparatively small if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. President, this proposed amendment is not just as I would have submitted it if I had drawn it on my own account. It excepts from its effects liquors used for mechanical, scientific, and medicinal purposes. I do not believe that alcohol or distilled liquors are necessary for any of those purposes. I would make no such exceptions. I would make the prohibition absolute. But others will not agree with me, and I have, for the present, deferred to the views of others who are earnestly seeking this legislation. I hope it may receive the early consideration and conscientious attention of Congress.

I ask to make the statement of Mr. Coovert a part of my remarks, without reading.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission to do so is granted.

The statement referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 20, 1913.

DATA IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION PROHIBITING MANUFACTURE, SALE, OR IMPORTATION OF DISTILLED LIQUORS.

(By E. E. Coovert.)

Proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting the sale, manufacture, and importation of distilled liquor containing alcohol after a limited period, say, of three years, after the ratification by the States, excepting for mechanical, scientific, and medicinal purposes under proper regulation of Congress, and giving Congress the power to enforce the same by proper legislation, the idea being not to interfere with the manufacture of fermented liquors, but placing upon such liquors the burden of supplying the revenue lost to the Government by reason of the suppression of the distilleries.

The following data will show this plan to be feasible, and from an economic standpoint highly desirable, eliminating entirely the moral equation.

CONSUMPTION OF WHISKY INCREASING.

On page 10 of the Report of Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, we find that 178,249,985 taxable gallons of distilled spirits were produced in the United States, not counting brandy and other liquors produced from fruit. This is the largest in the history of the country, and exceeds all previous productions by 2,847,590 gallons.

The amount withdrawn from the bonded warehouses, which measures the amount consumed of such distilled spirits, not counting fruit brandy, was 133,259,147 gallons. This exceeded the withdrawals of the year previous by 1,200,511 gallons.

The amount of revenue paid to the Government for the year 1912 for whisky and alcohol was \$146,715,203, and for brandy \$2,694,264.

A comparison of these figures will show the relative proportion of each manufactured and consumed.

The increase of revenue from whisky and alcohol over the previous year is \$1,332,440. (See p. 30, Report of Commissioner of Internal Revenue.)

The figures for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1913, are still more startling.

The Internal-Revenue Office shows that the receipts for distilled liquor for the first 10 months of the fiscal year ending May 1, 1913, were \$135,167,534.86, while for the corresponding period last year same were \$127,959,401.27, an increase of \$7,208,133.59, which, at \$1.10 per gallon, equals 6,552,848 gallons.

The amount of whisky produced for the year 1898 was only about 80,000,000 gallons.

Thus it will be seen that the production and consumption of spirituous liquors is increasing at a tremendous ratio.

DRY TERRITORY INCREASING.

The following table shows the large increase of prohibition States and dry territory under local option. This was obtained from the secretary of the National Brewery Association, New York City. I have checked this report, so far as I am able, and find it fairly accurate, although, of course, changes are constantly being made from dry territory to wet, and vice versa.

Local option States.	Dry towns and counties.	Wet towns and counties.	Population under dry territory.
California.....	647 towns.....	1 county.....	600,000
Delaware.....	2 counties.....	2 counties.....	80,000
Florida.....	37 counties.....	8 counties.....	658,271
Michigan.....	35 counties.....	48 counties.....	750,000
Missouri.....	66 counties.....	49 counties.....	1,210,890
Montana.....	All counties.....
Ohio.....	45 counties.....	43 counties.....	2,300,000
Arkansas.....	63 counties.....	12 counties.....	1,435,000
Arizona.....	All counties.....
Colorado.....	10 counties; 7 cities.....	48 counties.....	435,602
Connecticut.....	87 towns.....	81 towns.....	200,000
Kentucky.....	97 counties; 3 cities.....	22 counties.....	1,721,000
Illinois.....	30 counties; 8 cities.....	72 counties.....	704,809
Louisiana.....	30 parishes.....	29 parishes.....	850,000
Massachusetts.....	49 towns; 15 cities.....	1,061,589
Minnesota.....	Half villages are dry.....	1,060,000
New Hampshire.....	2 counties.....	8 counties.....	238,536
New York.....	412 no-license towns; 155 partial-license towns.....	366 full-license towns.....	646,710
Maryland.....	450,000
Idaho.....	17 counties; 3 cities.....	10 counties.....	217,159
Oregon.....	4 counties; 4 no-license cities.....	29 counties.....	230,000
Rhode Island.....	7 towns.....	16,850
South Dakota.....	17 counties.....	400,000
Texas.....	243 counties.....	171 counties.....	3,409,474
Vermont.....	7 counties; 6 cities.....	7 counties.....	284,862
Virginia.....	75 counties.....	25 counties.....	1,500,000
Wisconsin.....	47 dry towns.....	731 towns and villages.....	586,144
Iowa.....	81 counties.....	11 counties.....	1,718,752
Indiana.....	27 cities; 300 towns.....	1,755,569
Utah.....	87 towns.....	23 towns.....	125,000
Washington.....	6 counties; 1 city.....	30 counties.....	480,500
Total.....	25,126,689

* New Jersey: All wet; no local option.
 Pennsylvania: No local option.
 Wyoming: All wet, except country districts.
 South Carolina: Dispensaries.

Population of prohibition States.

Constitutional prohibition:	
Maine, 1884.....	742,371
Kansas, 1880.....	1,690,949
North Dakota, 1890.....	577,056
Mississippi, 1908.....	1,797,114
Tennessee, 1909.....	2,184,789
North Carolina, 1909.....	2,206,278
West Virginia, June, 1914.....	1,221,119
Statutory:	
Georgia, 1907.....	2,609,121
Oklahoma, 1907.....	1,657,155
Total.....	14,685,952
Adding, then, the total population in local-option dry territory.....	25,126,689

Brings the total population under dry territory in the United States at the present time to..... 39,812,641

The total population in the United States is approximately 95,000,000. With these facts of the increase of consumption of whisky and the increase of prohibition States and local-option territory, the conclusion is irresistible that prohibition in the States does not prohibit, that the States and local government are impotent to enforce the law, and that if the United States is to be saved from alcoholism the remedy must be applied at the root of the evil, and that is to abolish the distilleries and the importation of spirituous liquors.

ECONOMIC LOSS FROM DISTILLED LIQUOR.

The retail price paid by the consumer for spirituous liquors in the United States during the fiscal year of 1912 was approximately \$1,000,000,000—a total loss to the consumer and his dependents. This is based upon an estimate of 135,659,000 gallons retailing over the bar at \$7.50 per gallon—\$1,017,442,000.

PRESENT POWERS OF CONGRESS LIMITED.

Congress has not the power under the present Constitution of the United States to stop its manufacture. The powers of Congress enumerated in the Constitution do not include the regulation of police

power within a State, and when not so enumerated is reserved to the States under the eighth amendment.

So, it will take such an amendment as above proposed in order to accomplish the result desired.

FERMENTED LIQUORS AND TOTAL LIQUOR REVENUES.

The production of fermented liquors (beer) during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, was 62,176,894 barrels, a decrease of 1,106,429 barrels from the previous year. (See p. 13, Report of Commissioner of Internal Revenue.) This produced a revenue of \$1 per barrel. The receipts on beer for the first 10 months this year were \$52,217,423.55. The receipts for corresponding period last year were \$49,893,406.41, an increase this year of 2,324,017 barrels.

The amount of whisky imported last year was 5,567,833 gallons. This paid a duty of \$6,463,228. (See World Almanac, 1913, p. 249.)

Total receipts are estimated as follows:

Tax on whisky and alcohol.....	\$146,715,203
Tax on brandy.....	2,694,264
Duty on importations.....	6,463,228
Tax on beer.....	62,176,694

Total..... 218,049,389

So it will be seen that the immediate suppression of the manufacture and importation of all liquors, including fermented liquors, would lose to the Government \$218,049,389 per annum, besides the license fees.

This, of course, would be impracticable and would not be considered by Congress. The plan above suggested, however, minimizes to a large degree the evil effects of liquor and at the same time does not reduce the Government's revenue by leaving beer to stand the revenue thus lost, which will amount to approximately \$150,000,000 per annum. The beer industry can and should stand this loss. If 63,000,000 barrels per annum is produced, by doubling the revenue upon this and continuing the tax on whisky or spirituous liquors at the same or increased rate for the limited period after the constitutional amendment shall have become effective, it is assumed that sufficient revenue would be produced to take care of the deficiency. The profit in a barrel of beer is so enormous that the increased tax will be absorbed by the manufacturer and retailer and thus remain the same price to the consumer.

I am assuming that the evil effects of beer and wine are greatly less than those produced from the use of spirituous liquors.

I am also taking into consideration the immense amount of capital and labor represented in the beer and wine industries of the country.

COMPARATIVE PERCENTAGES OF ALCOHOL IN FERMENTED AND DISTILLED LIQUOR.

From Dr. John Billing's work on The Liquor Problem, a standard authority, volume 2, page 337, we find that the average percentage of alcohol contained in the different liquors is as follows:

	Per cent.
American beer.....	3.8
German beer.....	4.7
English ale.....	5
American champagne.....	8
French claret.....	8
Rhine wine.....	8.7
American red wine.....	9
Champagne.....	10
French white wine.....	10.3
Madeira.....	15
Sherry.....	17.5
Port.....	18

SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.	
Gin.....	30
Whisky:	
American, common.....	35
American, best.....	43
Scotch.....	40
Brandy.....	47
Absinthe.....	51
Rum.....	60

This percentage is by weight; the percentage of alcohol by bulk would be larger.

RELATIVE AMOUNT OF CAPITAL AND LABOR EMPLOYED.

The number of breweries operating in the United States is 1,461. (See p. 13, Report of Commissioner of Internal Revenue.)

The amount of capital invested in the manufacture of malt liquors is \$671,158,000, not counting cooperage and bottling industry, and it is the sixth industry in capital invested in the United States. The capital invested in wineries is \$27,908,000, which would bring this amount up to \$699,066,000, while the amount invested in distilleries is only \$72,450,000. (See U. S. Census Bureau Bulletin, 1910, p. 80.)

The number of men employed in breweries is 54,579, in wine industry 1,911, while the number of men employed in distilleries is only 6,430.

The wages paid out in the manufacture of whisky is \$3,074,000 per annum. The wages paid out for the manufacture of beer is \$41,208,000 per annum, and for manufacture of wine \$972,000 per annum. (See Prohibition Yearbook for 1912, p. 39.)

The amount of grain used in the manufacture of whisky is only about one-half of 1 per cent of the total product of grain producing liquor in the United States. The total crop for 1910 of grain was 5,143,187,000 bushels. (World Almanac, p. 163.) Of this amount the following was used in distilled liquor in 1911:

Barley.....	3,407,325
Wheat.....	21,765
Rye.....	5,376,018
Corn.....	23,247,004
Oats.....	13,172

Total (being one-half of 1 per cent of total)..... 32,065,284

(See Prohibition Yearbook for 1912.)

The number of distilleries now in operation is as follows:

Grain.....	417
Molasses.....	17
Fruit.....	386

Total (a decrease of 103 over the previous year)..... 820

In 1908 there were in operation 1,587. (See Internal Revenue Report, 1912, p. 12.)

These comparisons are made for the purpose of showing the small injury to the welfare of the people that would result from the suppression of spirituous liquors as compared to the fermented.

Last year it will be seen the number of distilleries was decreased 103. As the amount manufactured has increased, it must be assumed that the capacity of those remaining has been increased.

It will be seen that the amount of whisky imported and the amount of brandy manufactured is nominal.

The time may come when fermented liquor should also be put under the ban of the Government, but the enormous good to be derived from the experiment above outlined and at the same time preserving the revenue to the Government for the present justifies the discrimination above mentioned.

The main object of the time extension is to get rid of the immense supply on hand without confiscation and to increase the revenue from the production of whisky pending the period and to increase it permanently on beer, so as to take care of the deficit occasioned by the suspension of its manufacture.

After such a resolution has been properly ratified by 36 States, it would then be an easy matter for Congress by appropriate legislation to regulate the manufacture of sufficient quantities of alcohol or brandy for the uses set forth in the above exception. Similar regulations are now in force in many ways, and there could be nothing complicated or difficult in the enactment of such provisions.

The provisions of the Federal law regulating distilleries, the sale of machinery to the same, the provisions under which bonded warehouses are operated, and the denaturing of alcohol, and regulations for the sale of opium for medicinal purposes, which are in force now, are fair samples of the method Congress could use in the adoption of "appropriate legislation" to carry out the provisions of the exceptions set forth in the proposed amendment.

Mr. WORKS. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BRADLEY submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

STATUE OF ZACHARIAH CHANDLER.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. SMITH of Michigan) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 119), which was read and referred to the Committee on the Library:

Resolved, That exercises appropriate to the reception and acceptance from the State of Michigan of the statue of Zachariah Chandler, erected in Statuary Hall in the Capitol, be made the special order for Monday, July 28, 1913, after the conclusion of the routine morning business.

PROPOSED INCOME TAX.

Mr. BURTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 118), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed in pamphlet form for the use of the Senate 1,000 copies of section 2 of H. R. 3321.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS TO SENATORS.

Mr. JONES. I submit a resolution which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The resolution (S. Res. 117) was ordered to lie on the table and be printed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Vice President be authorized and directed to appoint a committee of five Senators to consider what clerical help should be allowed Senators and Senate committees. Such committee is instructed to consider and report to the Senate within 30 days from the passage of this resolution what clerical assistance should be allowed Senators to do their individual official work and what help should be allowed the different Senate committees to do committee work and the compensation which in their judgment should be paid such help, with a view to securing economy, efficiency, and fair treatment in the performance of the public business of the Senate and Senators.

Mr. JONES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 116), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the present session and during the next session of the Sixty-third Congress, until otherwise provided by law, each minority Senator having fewer than three employees shall be allowed one additional employee to be paid at the rate of \$1,200 per annum out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

THE PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have here resolutions of the governors who met in conference in Salt Lake City last week. They adopted certain resolutions with reference to the policy of the Government as to conservation, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolutions will be read.

The resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

We, the governors of public-land States, in conference assembled, believing that upon the administration of the laws governing the disposal of the public lands in a very large measure depends the future prosperity of our States, do hereby agree to the following statement of what we believe should be the policy of the National Government in the administration of the public lands:

First. That the newer States having been admitted in expressed terms on an equal footing in all respects whatever with the original States, no realization of that condition can be obtained until the State jurisdiction shall extend to all their territory, the taxing power to all their lands, and their political power and influence be thereby secured.

Second. That as rapidly as the States become prepared to take over the work of conservation, the Federal Government withdraw its bureaus from the field and turn the work over to the States.

Third. The permanent withdrawal of any lands within our States from entry and sale we believe to be contrary to the spirit and letter of the ordinance of 1787, the policy of which was followed for over a century, and we urge that such lands be returned to entry and opened to sale as speedily as possible.

Fourth. Dilatory action on the part of executive departments of the Government in passing title to purchasers of public lands is unfair to the States, as it permits purchasers to occupy the lands indefinitely without the State having power to tax them.

Fifth. We believe that the best development of these States depends upon the disposal of the public land to citizens as rapidly as the laws can be complied with.

Sixth. Bona fide homestead entry within forest-reserve boundaries should be permitted in the same manner as on unreserved lands, subject only to protest where lands selected are heavily timbered with trees of commercial value or are known to contain valuable mineral deposits.

Seventh. That the Government grant to the public-land States 5 per cent of the public land remaining in each, to be administered by the States as the school lands are now administered, for the purpose of building national public highways.

Eighth. That liberal land grants be made for the purpose of establishing and maintaining forestry schools in the public-land States.

Ninth. That rights of way for all lawful purposes be granted without unwarranted hindrance or delay.

Tenth. That all mineral lands now withheld from entry or classified at prohibitive prices be reopened to entry at nominal prices under strict provision against monopolization.

Eleventh. That we express our appreciation of the splendid work done by the department at Washington in cooperation with the several States in experimentation and instruction. This assistance has been most valuable in the education of our children and the development of our States, and we commend the same principle to the administration at Washington as being the most feasible plan for the present advancement of true conservation.

Twelfth. We believe that the National Government should provide for expert experimental work in the solution of the mining problems of the mineral States in the same manner that the Agricultural Department now assists the farmers in solving the agricultural problems.

Thirteenth. We believe that the speedy settlement of these public lands constitutes the true and best interests of the Republic. The wealth and strength of the country are its land-owning population.

Fourteenth. The best and most economical development of this western territory was accomplished under those methods in vogue when the States of the Middle West were occupied and settled. In our opinion, those methods have never been improved upon, and we advocate a return to these first principles of vested ownership with joint interest and with widely scattered individual responsibility.

A. PIATT ANDREW'S ADDRESS ON CURRENCY.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document an address delivered by Hon. A. Piatt Andrew in the Page lecture course at Yale University, entitled "The Crux of the Currency Question."

Dr. Andrew was formerly an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, was a professor in the economics department of Harvard University, and was connected with the National Monetary Commission in its work for four years. I think this address states the principles of the currency question as well as they have been stated by anyone, and I think it would be of general service if this address were printed as a public document.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I move to amend the request by providing that not more than 2,000 copies shall be printed for the use of the Senate and House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRISTOW. I object, Mr. President.

HOTEL ON FORT HUACHUCA MILITARY RESERVATION, ARIZ.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent to call up Senate bill 103, authorizing the Secretary of War to grant permission for the erection of a hotel on the Fort Huachuca Military Reservation in Arizona. It is a matter of importance, to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arizona. The bill authorizes the Secretary of

War to grant permission for the erection of a hotel on a military reservation?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes; and it is recommended by the Secretary of War.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is what I wanted to ask, if it was agreeable to the War Department.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is recommended by the War Department as an essential to the post.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEMBERS OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the provisions of section 36 of an act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913, the Chair, for the President of the Senate, announces the appointment of Mr. SWANSON and Mr. SUTHERLAND as members from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the commission provided for in the act.

FOREIGN TARIFF SYSTEMS AND INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that morning business is closed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the work of a Government bureau should be free from anything akin to partisan bias—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire what motion is before the Senate, or by what right the Senator from Utah is addressing the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I gave notice that on June 21, 1913, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, I should submit remarks upon foreign tariff systems and industrial conditions.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to inquire what right that notice gives to the Senator, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. I was recognized by the Chair at the close of the morning business, and this is the regular order.

Mr. NORRIS. Does giving notice that at the conclusion of the morning business a Senator intends to make a speech give him the right to the floor, without any motion pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The practice is a general one. It has grown into a rule. The remarks of the Senator, according to the notice given, are directed to foreign tariff systems. A bill on the subject of the tariff is before the Senate; that is to say, it is before a committee of the Senate; and according to the universal rule the course adopted by the Senator from Utah entitles him to address the Senate at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. Does it not follow that unanimous consent must be given for it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That has not been the rule heretofore. It would require some change in our practice.

Mr. NORRIS. If that were the case, all those who give notices—and there are several notices on the calendar similar to the one the Senator from Utah gave—could consume in that way, without any motion being before the Senate, all the time of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Whenever the practice grows into an abuse the Chair takes it for granted the Senate will take notice of it and will make provision for remedying it.

Mr. NORRIS. I would rather take notice of it now, Mr. President. I desire to inquire whether an objection now to the Senator proceeding without any motion being before the Senate would not cut him off?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair rules that it would not, according to the precedents of the Senate. There is no positive rule that covers that matter, but the universal custom in the Senate has been in accordance with the practice to which the Senator from Utah is now conforming.

Mr. NORRIS. Do I understand the Chair to say that if the practice went so far as to become obnoxious an objection then would cut off a Senator, or would it take a new rule in order to prevent Senators doing what the Senator from Utah is now doing?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is inclined to believe he will conform to the precedents of the Senate at the present time and will not undertake to reverse them. The Chair does not feel called upon to make a declaration as to

whether the observation of the Senator from Nebraska is timely. The Senator from Utah is recognized and will proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I was proceeding to say, the work of a Government bureau should be free from anything akin to partisan bias. Fortunately it is rare that a charge has been made to the contrary, but I hold in my hand a 66-page publication, which purports to be a report prepared "by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce at the request of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee," which contains statements that are not founded on fact, and which should never have appeared in the report of any bureau. New converts are generally conceded to be overzealous. Perhaps that may be the explanation of this report. There is a good deal in what is said about foreign tariff systems and other things to which no objection can be made, but there are a number of tables with reading matter and explanation which are open to serious objection. The first table purports to give the average ad valorem duties imposed in Canada and six European countries. It is said that "comparisons of this kind between imports and duties, while indicative of the general level of duties, are liable to misconception," and it adds:

It is particularly unsafe to compare variations for single years without examining the statistics in detail, since an abnormally heavy or light importation of a few articles, subject to specially high or low rates, may be responsible for the variation. The comparison between similar returns for different countries is even more liable to misconception; in some countries the bulk of the imports may be highly finished articles on which the rates are naturally higher than on raw products, which may be the chief imports of some of the other countries considered.

This liability to misconception is very clear in the table of the alleged ad valorem rates of different countries. No such rates are given for France and some other countries on dutiable imports alone, but an average ad valorem on all imports is given, apparently with the purpose of showing how much higher the rates are in the United States. Every one of the six countries for which these alleged ad valorem rates are given imposes specific duties on nearly every class of goods imported. Take France as an illustration. No effort whatever is made to appraise the value of imports in that country at the customhouse. The value is of no importance in assessing custom duties. But once a year a commission appointed by the Government assembles and estimates the value of all imports according to the average of prices for the preceding year. Of course, such an estimate is the rankest kind of guesswork. Consul General Mason, at Paris, and other American officials have repeatedly shown how these estimates are entirely worthless. It may be of value to France for political reasons to overvalue imports or undervalue exports, but it is impossible for such a commission to give anywhere near the actual values. French statistics of values, in regard to trade with the United States, are wholly at variance with our statistics. This fact in relation to the way values are assessed in countries imposing specific duties shows how utterly absurd is this table of ad valorem rates furnished by this bureau.

BOLSTERING UP THE SECRETARY'S HOBBY.

The genial head of the Department of Commerce, Secretary Redfield, as we all know, has a hobby, if I may so call it, about the alleged greater efficiency of labor, machinery, and so forth, in this country as compared with other nations, which, in his opinion, obviates the necessity of a protective tariff. Of course we on this side do not agree with that theory and think that the facts are directly to the contrary. But some one in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce evidently thought it was wise to try and bolster up the Secretary's theories.

I am aware that during political campaigns it is considered very popular by many partisan speakers to appeal to the vanity of the American laboring man with statements claiming that an American workman can do more work in eight hours than an Englishman, Frenchman, or German can do in two or three times that length of time. The most casual investigation proves the falsity of such a statement, and I have had many American workmen say that they are not deceived by such political claptrap. Many laboring men have worked in foreign factories as well as American factories, both institutions making the same class of goods, and have testified before committees of Congress that they produced in a given time as much of the manufactured product in their native countries as they produced in the same line of work in America. It is true that in a few lines of manufacture there is no doubt but that the American laboring man produces more of the finished product in a given time than the foreigner, for the reason that he is furnished with greater facilities, but this applies only to a limited number of industries.

The British Government, in 1907, undertook, for the first time, to make a census of production in that country. Our

Census Bureau makes a census of manufactures every five years. The census of production in the United Kingdom and the census of manufactures in this country are very different in a great many respects. This is partially explained in this report by the following statement:

In the British returns are represented many activities that are not generally understood as pertaining to manufactures, and are not embraced within this term as defined by the American and Canadian censuses. Building and other construction work, traction and the operation of telegraphs and telephones, and some other public utilities are included in the British as well as exploitation of mines and quarries and the operation of laundries.

Statistics for mines and quarries and steam laundries, and also for sawmills and gristmills, and such things, are excluded from the totals of our census returns. The British returns also take account of custom work and repairing carried on by small establishments, excluded from our census. Then the British returns fail to show the number of establishments in the country, or their capital, or miscellaneous expenses, all of which are given in our census returns. These facts will go to show how utterly impossible it is to make any comparison between the British returns and those in this country, but the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has made such a comparison, and a fearful and wonderful affair it is.

The British returns include Government work, navy, dock yards, and so forth, but our census does not include work of that kind. In their census of mechanical power they include all engines, whether used or not. If an establishment purchases its motive power, but has facilities for providing its own in the case of accidents or otherwise, the full capacity of such facilities is contained in the census, and also the purchased motor power is included in the returns of the corporation that furnishes it. Then, motor power for lighting purposes and for all other purposes is included. In this and other ways there is a wide difference between the British returns and those of our own Government, but that does not seem to interfere in the least with the comparison got out by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

MANIPULATING THE FIGURES.

A table is given showing for every \$100,000 added by manufacture the capacity of the engines in the United States and the United Kingdom, the number of wage earners, and for every \$1,000 added by manufacture the amount of wages paid. In explanation of these figures it is said:

For 1906 the board of trade made a series of elaborate investigations into the general subject of earnings and hours of labor. A number of more important industries were investigated separately and returns obtained from the establishment employing a proportion of wage earners in each group of industries. While no general average of wages for all industries can be given, it is believed that the figures of each separate industry may safely be used for comparison with the corresponding census returns of the United States.

That might appear reasonable to the uninitiated reader, but it is not correct, and the comparison is absolutely worthless. The report of the British Board of Trade on the cost of living distinctly states that "the English wages are the standard time rates recognized by the unions concerned, and the American rates, on the other hand, are on reports obtained from employers of actual earnings and from workers, public officials, and from other sources." It should be borne in mind that the British wages given in the report of the board of trade as to the cost of living are not the average of wages paid in any industry in that country, but are entirely the rates fixed by trade-unions. Only 14 men were employed in securing the returns for the volume on the cost of living and wages, and only the wages paid by the trade-unions in the building trades, foundries and machine shops, and hand compositors on job work in the printing trade were included.

DEFECTS IN THE BRITISH WAGE RETURNS.

A separate investigation was made of wages paid in various industries, but it was not a return such as is made by the census of the United States. For instance, in the textile trades returns were obtained for only 44 per cent of the workers, and those returns were furnished voluntarily by the employers. Home workers in those trades were not included. In the census returns in the United States full reports are received without any exception, and the wages paid are taken from the books by Government agents. In the clothing trades the British returns cover only 29 per cent of the employees, and those are all factory employees, and the returns were made by the employers. There are 1,500,000 persons employed in that industry in the United Kingdom, but only 789,000 work in factories and workshops.

This British return of wages is not made for any separate establishment, and the number of establishments is not given,

making a comparison as to the cost of production, such as that given in this table by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, altogether untrustworthy.

EVIDENCE FROM A ROYAL COMMISSION.

The British Government in 1906 appointed a royal commission, composed of eminent men and women, to investigate the poor laws and relief of distress in that country. That commission was engaged for some years in making a thorough investigation of the subject, and its report is contained in 41 volumes, a single volume containing 1,288 folio pages, and they are all of about the same size. There was no limit as to expenditures of this commission, and no question has ever been raised, so far as heard, of the thoroughness of its investigations and reports. The board of trade publishes every month the percentage of persons unemployed in Great Britain. This British commission, referring to that report of the board of trade, says:

The percentage of persons unemployed, regularly published by the board of trade, relates only to about 600,000 men out of about 2,000,000 trade-unionists and 12,000,000 adult wage earners, the 600,000 being those entitled to ordinary out-of-work pay; and there is reason to assume that this small sample includes an altogether exaggerated proportion of workmen, especially among shipbuilding and engineering trades, liable to great fluctuations of employment. Of this relatively small group of highly organized trade-unionists, in good years about 4 men out of 5 get almost constant employment, in bad years about 3 out of 5, while the minority who are unemployed suffer severely, even to being out of work for months at a time. This insufficient data tells us nothing as to the condition of the mass of wage earners. There are no statistics which enable us to compute even within the hundred thousands how many persons are at one time simultaneously in distress from unemployment.

The commission goes on, by way of illustration, to relate that the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, an old and highly organized trade-union established in 1860, pays unemployed benefits, but finds it an increasingly heavy burden. In 1908 it amounted to 1s. 10½d. (45 cents) a week, irrespective of sickness, superannuation, burial, and strike pay. In 1908 that organization lost nearly 100 persons a week, and there are four times as many carpenters outside of that organization as within it. The commission says there are at least 1,250,000 men—possibly twice that many—out of employment.

Dr. Downes, one of the members of that commission, who is the senior medical inspector for poor-law purposes of the local government board for England, in his report said:

The most disquieting index of urban pauperism is the increase in the proportion of able-bodied men in health who are dependent upon the poor rates and the growing percentage of applications to committees under the unemployed workmen act.

ENORMOUS NUMBER OF PAUPERS IN UNITED KINGDOM.

The British Government also publishes each month the number of paupers relieved, to show the number existing in the United Kingdom. This royal commission reporting on these published returns says:

These figures do not give an adequate idea of the numbers brought under the influence of the poor law authorities within a specified time. They are the number relieved on a given day and take no account of those relieved at other times. The number of persons, excluding lunatics in asylums and casual paupers, under the care of guardians of the poor in the year ending September 30, 1907, was 1,709,436, or 2.15 times greater than the mean of numbers relieved on January 1 and July 1. The rate of pauperism was 47.7 per 1,000, as against 22.7 per 1,000, shown by the counts as published by the Government for the same year. Omitting insane and casuals, 1 out of every 47 was a pauper on July 1, 1907, and 1 out of every 44 on January 1, 1908. Not only has there been a progressive increase in the number of men in receipt of indoor relief, but the rate of male pauperism to male population of the same age was higher in 1901 than in 1891 at every age from 45 years upward, and the break widens as age increases. The rate for 1906 is higher than for 1901 at every age group.

The commission then shows how greatly lacking is an estimate of unemployed when founded on the returns of the trade-unions, which only relate to such persons in the unions as receive pay for unemployment. In the same way the Government reports as to pauperism are absolutely worthless, not showing one-half the number, according to this royal commission's report, and in the same way the Government reports as to wages, founded altogether on the wages fixed by the trade-unions, which do not embrace more than 16 per cent of the adult workers in the United Kingdom, are also worthless. But when for comparison the British Government reported on wages in this country it did not confine itself to trade-unions by any means. In fact, they had very little to do with the reports.

A FICTITIOUS POWER CALCULATION.

The table given in the report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce not only gives motor power which is largely fictitious, but it gives wages for every \$1,000 added by manufacture that are absolutely fraudulent. For instance, it states, to add \$1,000 by manufacture of cotton goods in the United Kingdom \$597 are paid out as compared with \$516 in the United States, and that in the same way in the production of cutlery

and tools \$640 is paid out in the United Kingdom as compared with \$490 in this country, but in the production of gloves we are alleged to pay out \$457 as compared with \$439 in the United Kingdom. There is hardly a department store in the United States that does not have English gloves on sale, which pay duty at an equivalent, according to the Ways and Means Committee, of 44.15 per cent ad valorem. Yet, notwithstanding this fact, our free-trade opponents assert that it costs more to manufacture them in England; hence they propose to reduce the duty and enlarge the market here for British gloves. In shipbuilding, for instance, it is said that \$679 is paid out in the United Kingdom as compared with \$600 in this country. Any intelligent man knows that the British shipbuilding industry is one of the most efficient in the world. They construct ships at very much less cost than in this country, which no one will dispute, but according to this ridiculous statement of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce it costs in wages \$79 more for every \$1,000 added by manufacture in the production of ships in the United Kingdom as compared with this country. It only illustrates the ridiculous character of this table and the report relating to it. Mr. President, I wish every Senator had a copy of this report and could turn to page 39 and follow me as I call attention to some of the statistics presented, and may be quoted by some to prove that \$1,000 of manufactured goods can be produced in the United States with a less wage cost than in the United Kingdom. It attempts to show another unbelievable thing, that \$1,000 of manufactured goods of nearly every variety can be produced in Canada with a less wage cost than in the United Kingdom. I ask that the table be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRISTOW in the chair). The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Industry.	For every \$100,000 added by manufacture.				For every \$1,000 added by manufacture.			
	Capacity of engines.		Number of wage earners.		Amount of wages.			
	United States.	United Kingdom.	United States.	Canada.	United States.	Canada.	United States.	United Kingdom.
Paints and varnishes.....	122	126	31	28	104	\$180	\$142
Soap and candles.....	73	123	34	38	101	161	151
Brick, tiles, and pottery.....	365	340	108	104	265	542	373
Wire and manufactures of wire.....	222	367	73	59	165	401	305	\$498
Tin plate.....	134	105	88	205	545	744
Cutlery and tools.....	192	170	92	73	214	490	408	\$640
Agricultural implements and machines.....	117	59	86	333	463
Clocks and watches.....	62	34	99	239	538	617
Automobiles, bicycles, motorcycles, and parts.....	66	77	65	90	166	419	303	\$544
Railway cars.....	233	182	96	82	156	604	423	505
Carriages and wagons.....	162	78	90	81	219	482	400
Furniture.....	169	118	98	103	185	500	426	\$559
Sugar.....	415	254	39	50	107	234	272
Flour and grist milling.....	762	596	34	22	93	185	106
Baking.....	41	42	63	71	175	374	294
Butter, cheese, condensed milk, and oleomargarine.....	254	205	47	49	136	282	141
Brewing.....	125	34	20	32	34	148	205
Cotton goods.....	504	114	47	118	255	516	416	597
Bleaching, dyeing, and finishing.....	223	382	91	48	191	440	209	506
Linen, jute, and hemp goods.....	394	414	128	128	320	454	299	490
Woolen and worsted goods.....	223	358	109	142	283	474	493	552
Silk goods.....	110	224	111	101	358	433	365	601
Hosiery and knit goods.....	115	56	144	124	312	498	390	583
Clothing, handkerchiefs, and millinery.....	17	23	90	119	283	410	466	\$456
Paper, paper goods, and wood pulp.....	839	487	60	75	220	311	340
Printing, binding, and publishing.....	56	70	48	75	163	307	392
Boots and shoes.....	53	51	110	104	299	547	421	\$594
Gloves.....	28	24	109	103	212	457	385	439
Leather, and manufactures of, not specified.....	137	106	75	49	188	392	232
Explosives, firearms and ammunition, and fireworks.....	132	184	63	41	163	372	202
Shipbuilding.....	209	145	96	99	198	600	533	679

1 Wire drawing and working.

2 Edge tools, spades, files, etc.

3 Cycle making and repairing.

4 Cabinetmaking and allied trades, including shop fitting and chair making.

5 Not including custom work.

6 Ready-made only.

Mr. SMOOT. Before passing from this I will take the time to call particular attention to a few of the industries. For every \$100,000 added by manufacture, the report claims, it takes engine capacity as follows:

	United States.	United Kingdom.
Sugar.....	415	254
Silk goods.....	110	224
Paper, paper goods, and wood pulp.....	839	487
Cotton goods.....	504	114
Woolen and worsted goods.....	223	358

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator permit me to ask him what report he refers to? I was not in the Chamber when the Senator began his remarks.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the report on foreign tariff systems and industrial conditions prepared by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Again, to produce the same amount, the report states that the following number of wage earners are required:

	United States.	Canada.	United Kingdom.
Brick, tile, and pottery.....	108	104	265
Tin plate.....	88	205
Clocks and watches.....	69	239
Sugar.....	39	50	107
Butter, cheese, condensed milk, and oleomargarine.....	47	49	136
Cotton goods.....	47	118	255
Bleaching, dyeing, and finishing.....	91	48	191
Linen, jute, and hemp goods.....	128	128	320
Woolen and worsted goods.....	109	142	283
Silk goods.....	111	101	358
Hosiery and knit goods.....	144	124	312
Paper, paper goods, and wood pulp.....	839	487	220
Shipbuilding.....	96	99	198

Again, for every \$1,000 added by manufacture it requires the payment of the following amount of wages:

	United States.	Canada.	United Kingdom.
Cotton goods.....	\$516	\$416	\$597
Linen, jute, and hemp goods.....	454	299	490
Woolen and worsted goods.....	474	493	552
Silk goods.....	433	365	601
Shipbuilding.....	600	533	679

The British Government in reporting on wages in this country as compared with the United Kingdom, notwithstanding that it only took trade-union wages in the latter country, reported that the average weekly wage in this country was approximately two and one-third times greater than the wages in England and Wales, two and five-sixths times greater than the wages in Germany, three and one-half times the wages in France, and three and three-fourths times the wages in Belgium. It also found that the hours were shorter in this country. It found that in Germany there was an average increase in wages of 9 per cent between October, 1905, and March, 1908, but in England and Wales the level of wages in the building trades was the same in 1908 as in 1905, and in the engineering trades—that is, foundries and machine shops—the increase in that time was only 1½ per cent. There was a very marked increase in the wages in the United States, which only serves to show the difference between wages in a protective-tariff country, as in this country and Germany, and in free-trade England. As to the cost of living, the British report excludes London, though it includes New York and other cities in this country in making a comparison, but it finds a ratio of 138 for the United States, as compared with 100 for England and Wales, London excluded; but bakers' bread is a very large item in the British cost of living, amounting to 22 pounds a week in the average workingman's family in that country, whereas in the United States bakers' bread is not used at all in the great majority of workingmen's families, and in none of them to any large extent. It is acknowledged that the consumption of meat is larger in the United States, as well as the consumption of vegetables, and the reports state that "the dietary of the American workingman's family is more liberal and more varied than that of the corresponding families in the United Kingdom."

THE TESTIMONY OF MR. GOMPERS.

The truth is that the situation in Europe is very well shown by Samuel Gompers in writing about the result of his investiga-

tions in England, France, and Germany in 1909. Speaking about this subject he stated:

The deepest impression that England made upon me comes from its poverty. Physically thousands have become unfortunate and are almost irreclaimable from idleness. Vice and the result of idleness make of them ready victims of death. Poverty is on view in all parts of London; figures in dirt and rags slouch along amid gay and well-attired promenaders in the park. With regret I must confess that I came away from London with a sense of depression; from time to time since those numbers of degraded objects which ought to have been men and women have formed in my mind's eye a procession moving along together past me, mournful, helpless, a disgrace to our boasted civilization. The Old World is not our world. In the procession America is first.

In speaking of the work in the shipyards of England and Scotland, Mr. Gompers says that wages range from \$6 to less than \$9 per week. In American shipyards the highest-class labor is paid almost that much in a day. But if the statistics of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce were considered wages would be higher in England. Mr. Gompers said that in the matter of the cost of living that if an American workman would live the same as the European wage earner is compelled to do, the cost of living would be about the same, and that is the fact which is not upset in any way by the British report, because it is acknowledged in that report that in bakers' bread and one or two other things not used in this country, but used extensively in the United Kingdom, the difference is made up.

GREATER EMPLOYMENT OF FEMALES IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Another fact which does not appear in this comparison of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is the greater employment of female and child labor in the United Kingdom. In the pottery industry, for instance, the percentage of female labor as compared with male labor in this country is 100 males to 20 females; in England, 100 males to 80 females; in Germany, 100 males to 300 females. Sixty-two per cent of the textile employees in England are females, while in the United States in the wool and worsted industry 41.3 per cent are females, and in the cotton industry 38.7 per cent of those over 16 years of age. In the wool and worsted industry in England 56.7 per cent are females, and in the hosiery industry 74.6 per cent, and in the silk industry 68.7 per cent. This large employment of women and children in England may make the average number employed seem larger, although women are paid very much less in England in proportion to the male pay than is the case in the United States.

WHAT COMMERCIAL AGENTS FOUND.

It is said in this report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce that the investigations of the United States commercial agents bear out the assertions as to the greater efficiency of labor, machinery, and so forth, in this country. But that is not true. Reports of commercial agents depend largely upon the men employed. I am sorry to say that a few agents who have gone abroad were not competent for the work which they undertook, and in at least one case were not even able to write the English language correctly. Capt. Carden, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, was detailed as a commercial agent, and made a thorough inquiry as to the large establishments of Europe and showed himself entirely competent to do the work. He found the same machinery in use in Europe that is used in the United States and the same effective methods of administration. The only difference he found in favor of this country was in the larger establishments, in some cases, which devoted themselves exclusively to one product, in that case producing it at a less cost than an establishment which manufactures several different articles at the same time. But that is not the case in everything by any means. For instance, in chemicals we are far behind Europe. One establishment in Germany employs 10,000 persons, which is exclusive of their numerous agencies. A chemical establishment in England employs 7,000 persons, and is interested in several other establishments; one in France has a large number of establishments and employs a force much greater than in any similar establishment in the United States. Then, the trusts and syndicates control the chemical industry in Europe and dump their surplus products in this country. In the chemical industry we are deficient as compared with Europe for the reason that sufficient protection has never been given fine chemicals to establish the industry in this country.

EFFICIENCY OF LABOR ABROAD.

As to efficiency of labor, while it is customary for some of our free-trade friends to assert that because of this superior efficiency we do not need any tariff in this country, when we have to compete with Europe the facts demonstrate quite to the contrary. A large proportion of the labor in this country came from Europe, particularly skilled labor. The European mills are filled with workmen who make the business a life study and stay in one place, thus producing greater efficiency.

In this country it is customary to move about, and the apprenticeship system is not developed here to the extent that it is in Europe, while Government assistance is given there in the way of technical schools and other educational advantages for trades much greater than is the case in the United States.

Charles Delaney, president of the National Association of Glue & Gelatin Manufacturers, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee that the subject of the efficiency of wage earners in this country as compared with Europe has been repeatedly discussed in that association, and it was the experience of men in his business, who had knowledge of European conditions, that labor was not more efficient here.

The imports alone would demonstrate the falsity of the assertion that labor is more efficient here than abroad. Joseph Benn & Sons, who have a mill at Greystone, R. I., and another one at Bradford, England, announce that they will close their mill at Greystone if the rates proposed in the Underwood bill on wool and woolen goods take effect, for the reason that they can produce so much cheaper in Bradford that they could not afford to operate the mill at Greystone. They have already thrown some 400 workmen out of employment, and are ceasing to do any work except on orders, because of the menace of this Democratic tariff bill. Julius Forstman, a German who has been in the manufacturing business in Germany and who was a member of the tariff commission which formed the last tariff in that country, has a mill in Passaic, N. J. Mr. Forstman is a man of large experience, and he ridicules the talk of greater efficiency of labor in this country as compared with Europe. He finds it difficult to get reliable, competent labor in this country, but had no such difficulty in Germany. Legislation based on any talk of greater efficiency of labor, in many of the industries in the United States as compared with Europe, would be based on as false an assumption as are the statistics given in this report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

EVIDENCE FROM BRITISH INVESTIGATORS.

Arthur Shadwell, M. A., M. D., made a long investigation as to the efficiency of labor in England and in other countries, including the United States, which was published by Longmans, Green & Co., of London, and a new edition was issued in 1900 after further investigation by Dr. Shadwell. In this last edition he says:

During the winter of 1907 and 1908 I went through a large number of workshops in several of the most important manufacturing centers in England, including some which I had visited five years before. The change was very noticeable. I found workshops reconstructed, reorganized, and reequipped, old appliances replaced by new, the most recent tools and machinery installed, and a general air of renovation. * * * British manufacturers took up the American idea of high-speed steel and machinery tools with great energy. Sheffield is without a single rival. British makers have recovered their lost ground and are once more ahead. Their machinery tools to-day are more varied and more economical than those of the United States. British makers are well ahead in actual speed for some classes of machinery. * * * Boot making by machinery is wholly an American development. English manufacturers not only equip their factories with machinery, but also adopt American styles and have succeeded in turning out goods equally attractive and cheap and of better quality. The factory trade was revolutionized. The whole situation has been changed by the patent act of 1907, nullifying the boycott agreements in leasing arrangements, and compelling American makers of boot machinery to manufacture in this country so that English makers can now compete on fair terms. This act is having a substantial effect in increasing productive employment in this country. The boot trade is only one of several affected by it.

Lord Brassey, an eminent Englishman, wrote a book a number of years ago on Foreign Work and English Wages. In 1908 Mr. S. J. Chapman, M. A., professor of political economy in the University of Manchester, issued two volumes, which were published by Longmans, bringing up to date the work previously done by Lord Brassey, who wrote an introduction to these books, in which he said:

In home industries labor-saving machinery has been increasingly used and better methods of work have been adopted. To-day the master builders of London can hold their own with every other great city at home or abroad, whether in workmanship, rate of progress, or lowness of cost.

COST OF LIVING NO LESS IN ENGLAND.

Speaking of the cost of living in England and efficiency of labor, as compared with this country, Lord Brassey says—and he made a personal investigation:

The cost of living is about the same here as in the United States. The rough work around blast furnaces is not attractive to Americans. The workers in that branch (in the United States) are mostly foreigners, inferior in efficiency to the skilled men in British establishments. We possess unrivaled advantages in shipbuilding. Our workmen are second to none. The cost of a steamship in the United States, according to Mr. Chapman, is 15 per cent to 25 per cent greater than with us. In the manufacture of locomotives, in efficiency the English makers can hold their own. English makers retain the leadership in cotton and linen machinery. British machine-tool makers hold their own even in competition with the United States. The cotton industry of Great Britain has been long in a commanding position. Factory operatives are trained from childhood. We have an advantage in the humidity of our climate. American operatives are a migratory body, recruited from every nationality. In silk the French are preeminent.

In chemicals and dyes we have allowed our German competitors to pass ahead. They have succeeded through the care and liberality bestowed by their Government. French exports of chemicals are only about one-half those of England; but the exports of the United States are little more than half those of France. It is satisfactory to know that Great Britain, the pioneer in the construction of railways, has maintained an ever-advancing standard of efficiency. British workmen are second to none.

NO DIFFERENCE IN EFFICIENCY OF LABOR.

That is the testimony of an eminent Englishman who has been honored by his own and other Governments, and who speaks of the efficiency in that and other countries from personal inquiries. With just as efficient workmen, trained for life in their callings, the British employers have all of the advantages of machinery, the same as an American manufacturer, and pay wages that are in many cases two-thirds less than the rates paid in the United States, and that is substantiated by the report of the British Government. In the volume issued by the British Government reporting wages in that country it is stated that bricklayers in the United States in 1905 received an average for several hours less work a week than their British competitors of 110s. 6d., but the average paid in the building trades in Great Britain for full time for men was 32s., while the highest paid in any industry under that classification was 40s. a week, paid only to 13 per cent of the workers. In the same way a mason is credited with receiving 96s. in the United States as compared with less than 30s. in Great Britain. As a matter of fact, these wages quoted for the United States are much below the rates paid in New York and some other cities. The British Government credits plumbers with receiving 94s. in the United States, and compositors in printing offices 95s. as compared with wages in similar industries in the United Kingdom of less than a third as much.

In the building trades, according to British official returns, in the United Kingdom 5 per cent of the men working full time receive less than 20s. a week—\$5—and 37 per cent of them received between 20 and 30s.—between \$5 and \$7—a week, while the average in all the building trades for full-time summer work is a little over \$7 a week. In some of the trades in this classification in the United States men earn almost that much in a day. It is admitted that the pay in Great Britain is less in the winter than in the summer.

WOMEN IN THE BUILDING TRADES.

Women are employed in the building trades there, and the average rate of wages for them is \$3.10 a week, while boys under 20 years of age get \$2.28 a week. It is stated in this official British report that since 1900 there has been no change in wages in building trades; that is, the "general level" is the same; but in the United States there has been a very marked increase in that period. Of course rates of wages differ in various parts of the United Kingdom. The average earnings of a man in full time in the building trades, in United States money, in Ireland is \$6.66 a week. That includes plumbers, masons, bricklayers, carpenters, and various other workers in that line, and serves to show the absurdity of asking the American workman to compete with such wages. Locomotive engineers receive on an average \$9.22 a week. Men working full time in machine joinery, sawmills, and so forth, average in the United Kingdom \$6.56 a week, while boys under 20 years who are employed in the same work average \$2.98 a week. Thank God women are not employed in such work as the building trades in the United States, and I never want to see the day arrive when they will be. These are official British Government returns, concerning which there can be no dispute.

These returns state that in the public utilities service—roads and sanitation, gas, electricity, tramways, and omnibuses—the average pay for men in the United Kingdom is \$6.48 a week, and for boys under 20 years of age, \$2.88 a week. Men at work on the roads and in sanitary employment in the rural districts receive \$4.30 a week on the average. Men at work on tramways or street cars and omnibuses receive on the average \$7.32 a week. The situation is much worse in the agricultural districts, where men working full time, including everything allowed them, receive in the summer in England an average of \$4.40 a week and in Ireland \$2.70 a week. It is difficult to believe that able-bodied men can live on such wages. Those wages include all allowances of any kind for living purposes, as stated in the British report. In five counties in Ireland, according to this report, the average wages for men on farms employed full time is \$2.40 a week. The highest pay in any county in Ireland for farm labor is \$3.36 a week and the lowest \$2.32 a week. In Oxfordshire, England, the average farm pay for men working full time is \$3.92 a week, and the hours of employment are from 11 to 12 a day. It is no wonder that there has been such an enormous decrease in the number of farm laborers in England and that millions of acres of land have ceased to be

cultivated. How anyone can live on such wages while the cost of living, according to such an eminent authority as Lord Brassey, is practically the same as in the United States is hard to understand. It is further stated that there has been no change in farm wages since 1902.

WHAT SOME TRADE WORKERS ARE PAID.

The average pay for boot and shoe workers, full time of from 52½ to 54 hours a week, in England is from \$6.22 to \$7.20 a week. The British reports show a decrease of 20 per cent of the land under cultivation in Ireland in 1906 as compared with 1851, and a further large reduction in England. In the cotton industry 16 per cent of the men working full time earn less than 20 shillings a week, or \$5, while there is nearly the same percentage in the woolen industry. Forty-four per cent of the men in the linen industry earn less than 20 shillings a week, 49 per cent in the jute industry, 51 per cent in the hair industry, 19 per cent in the silk industry, and 22 per cent in the hemp industry. Nearly 44 per cent of the men in the cotton industry earn between 20 and 30 shillings a week, or from \$5 to \$7.20. Thirteen per cent of the women in that industry working full time earn less than \$2.40 a week, while 39 per cent earn between 10 and 15 shillings, or between \$2.40 and \$3.60 a week. The average for women working full time in the woolen and worsted industry is \$3.32 a week, and in the linen industry \$2.58 a week, and in the hemp industry \$2.62 a week, and so on in other industries. How women can live on such wages passes understanding in this country. Boys under 20 years of age working full time in the linen industry receive \$2.02 a week and in the woolen industry \$2.44 a week. Girls under 18 years of age in the linen industry receive \$1.76 a week, and they are paid still less in the hemp industry and little more in the woolen and cotton industries. The average hours of labor in the cotton industry are 55.5 a week and in the silk industry 54.5. In the clothing industry, which, under the proposed new tariff bill will be afforded little, if any, protection in the United States, the average men's earnings in England, according to the Government report, are \$6.78 a week, while the average for women is \$3.12 a week, with correspondingly low wages for boys and only an average of \$1.36 a week for girls under 18 years of age. Even then the employment is irregular. The full average wage for women in millinery, clothing, artificial flowers, gloves, furs, and so forth, is only \$3.24 a week. But women predominate in nearly all of these industries, and there are 38,000 in the boot and shoe industry alone. Over 21 per cent of the women in this industry earn less than \$2.40 a week for full time.

In 1889 there were 49,000 persons employed in boot and shoe factories, but in 1904 there were 102,489. This was the result of improved machinery and of doing the work in factories instead of in private houses. It would be easy to go on quoting from these Government statistics to show the remarkably low wages paid in the United Kingdom, and it must not be forgotten that our British friends claim that the wages are higher in that country than in some of the other countries of Europe. But when a comparison is made with the United States and the fact considered that it is proposed to cut down the tariff rates to the great extent contemplated by this Democratic tariff bill, no one need be surprised over the fact that there has been a loss in a few months of hundreds of millions of dollars in the values of stocks and bonds of corporations in this country.

Whenever statistics are gathered from the realm of speculation, and with no other object in view than to demonstrate some pet idea, the information sought to be conveyed by them necessarily becomes misleading, and such a practice should be condemned, no matter by whom indulged in. I leave the Senate to judge if this report should not be condemned.

OKANOGAN RIVER BRIDGE, WASHINGTON.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator consent to yield to me to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bridge bill? It will take but a moment.

Mr. STONE. I withdraw the motion at the request of the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1353) to authorize the board of county commissioners of Okanogan County, Wash., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Okanogan River at or near the town of Malott.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 21, 1913.

MINISTER.

John D. O'Rear, of Missouri, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia, vice Horace G. Knowles, resigned.

CONSUL.

Philip Holland, of Tennessee, now consul at Saltillo, to be consul of the United States of America at Basel, Switzerland, vice George Gifford, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

John L. Pickering, of Illinois, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighth district of Illinois, in place of Frank L. Smith, resigned.

Andrew C. Gilligan, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Ohio, in place of Bernhard Bettman, resigned.

MINISTER.

Henry Van Dyke, of New Jersey, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Netherlands and Luxemburg, vice Lloyd Bryce, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

George W. Jack, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana, vice E. H. Randolph, resigned.

Lewis M. Coleman, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee, vice James B. Cox, whose resignation has been accepted.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

Thomas Ewing, jr., of New York, to be Commissioner of Patents, vice Edward B. Moore.

FIRST ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

Robert T. Frazier, of Nashville, Tenn., to be First Assistant Commissioner of Patents, vice Cornelius C. Billings.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Edward C. Hargadine, of Montana, to be receiver of public moneys at Glasgow, Mont., vice Walter Shanley, term expired.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Thomas R. Jones, of Glasgow, Mont., to be register of the land office at Glasgow, Mont., vice Truman M. Patten, term expired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Frank K. Chapin, Ninth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from June 20, 1913, vice First Lieut. Harry B. Jordan, Eighth Cavalry, detailed in the Ordnance Department on that date.

Second Lieut. Henry L. Watson, First Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from June 20, 1913, vice First Lieut. Frederick E. Shnyder, Eighth Cavalry, detailed in the Ordnance Department on that date.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. Philip H. Worcester, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from June 20, 1913, vice Capt. Glen F. Jenks, detailed in the Ordnance Department on that date.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM JUNE 12, 1913.

Corps of Engineers.

Cadet Francis Kosier Newcomer.
Cadet Charles Francis Williams.
Cadet Gordon Russell Young.
Cadet Richard Ulysses Nicholas.
Cadet Myron Bertman.
Cadet Leo Jerome Dillow.
Cadet James Archer Dorst.
Cadet Rufus Willard Putnam.
Cadet Lunsford Errett Oliver.

Cavalry Arm.

Cadet Allen G. Thurman.
Cadet George Wessely Sliney.

Cadet Eugene Tritle Spencer.
Cadet Willis Dale Crittenger.
Cadet Alfred Bainbridge Johnson.
Cadet Falkner Heard.
Cadet Roland Louis Gaugler.
Cadet Stuart Warren Cramer, jr.
Cadet Thoburn Kaye Brown.
Cadet Silas Miram Ratzkoff.
Cadet Geoffrey Keyes.
Cadet Frederick John Gerstner, jr.
Cadet Clarence Earl Bradburn.
Cadet Joseph Wadsworth Viner.
Cadet John Arthur Considine.
Cadet David Beauregard Falk, jr.
Cadet Earl Lindsey Canady.
Cadet Louis Aleck Craig.
Cadet George Edward Lovell, jr.
Cadet Desmore Otts Nelson.

Field Artillery Arm.

Cadet William Chalmers Young.
Cadet William Carey Crane, jr.
Cadet William Bleacher Rosevear, jr.
Cadet Carlos Brewer.
Cadet David Edward Cain.
Cadet John Eugene McMahon, jr.

Coast Artillery Corps.

Cadet Francis Augustus Englehart.
Cadet William Ashley Cophorne.
Cadet Selby Harney Frank.
Cadet Robert Heber Van Volkenburgh.
Cadet Samuel John Heidner.
Cadet Junius Wallace Jones.
Cadet Manning Marius Kimmel, jr.
Cadet Vern Scott Purnell.
Cadet Robert Meredith Perkins.
Cadet Lawrence Babbitt Weeks.
Cadet William Cooper Foote.
Cadet Stewart Shepherd Giffin.
Cadet Ward Elverson Duvall.
Cadet James Brown Gillespie.
Cadet Charles Lawrence Kilburn.
Cadet Redondo Benjamin Sutton.
Cadet Paul Duke Carlisle.
Cadet Francis Joseph Toohey.

Infantry Arm.

Cadet Lewis King Underhill.
Cadet Harold Smith Martin.
Cadet John Huff Van Vliet.
Cadet Leland Swarts Devore.
Cadet Charles Addison Ross.
Cadet Douglass Taft Greene.
Cadet Clarence Hagbart Danielson.
Cadet James Nixon Peale.
Cadet Francis Reuel Fuller.
Cadet Clinton Warden Russell.
Cadet William Richard Schmidt.
Cadet George Lester Hardin.
Cadet Otis Keilholtz Sadtler.
Cadet William Henry Jones, jr.
Cadet John Erskine Ardrey.
Cadet Carlyle Hilton Wash.
Cadet Henry Pratt Perrine, jr.
Cadet Dennis Edward McCunniff.
Cadet Henry Balding Lewis.
Cadet Henry Barlow Cheadle.
Cadet Wyndham Meredith Manning.
Cadet Samuel Alexander Gibson.
Cadet Paul Woolever Newgarden.
Cadet Harley Bowman Bullock.
Cadet Charles Andrew King, jr.
Cadet Dana Palmer.
Cadet Alexander McCarrell Patch, jr.
Cadet Charles Bishop Lyman.
Cadet Robert Lily Spragins.
Cadet George Washington Krapf.
Cadet Charles Harrison Corlett.
Cadet Hans Robert Wheat Herwig.
Cadet Howard Calhoun Davidson.
Cadet William Lynn Roberts.
Cadet William Alexander McCulloch.
Cadet Bernard Peter Lamb.
Cadet William Augustus Rafferty.
Cadet Lathe Burton Row.
Cadet John Flowers Crutcher.

POSTMASTER.
KANSAS.

John H. Shields to be postmaster at Wichita, Kans., in place of William C. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1912.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 21, 1913.

AMBASSADOR.

Thomas Nelson Page to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Italy.

MINISTERS.

Pleasant A. Stovall to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Switzerland.

William E. Gonzales to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Cuba.

Benjamin L. Jefferson to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Nicaragua.

Edward J. Hale to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Costa Rica.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Harry L. Gandy to be receiver of public moneys at Rapid City, S. Dak.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

George H. Emmerson,
George E. Brandt.
Robert O. Baush.
John C. Hilliard.
Karl F. Smith.
Owen St. A. Botsford.
Donald T. Hunter.
Henry B. Le Bourgeois.
Cleveland McCauley.
Leslie C. Davis.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons:

Edward A. Schumann.
Robert L. Payne, jr.
Bruce Elmore.
Charles C. Ammerman.
William B. Hetfield.
Frank H. Haigler.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Adiel R. Scott, McDonough.

KENTUCKY.

Jordan W. Crossfield, Lawrenceburg.

NEBRASKA.

W. C. Bartlett, Elmwood.
V. W. Clayton, Wisner.
J. B. Lane, Blue Hill.
Frank D. Strobe, Orchard.

NORTH CAROLINA.

J. H. Bowen, West Durham.

OKLAHOMA.

A. Tarlton Embree, Henryetta.
Simon Peter Treadwell, Ryan.
J. Lee Wilemon, Rush Springs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, June 23, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.
The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

REUNION CELEBRATION AT GETTYSBURG, PA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the resolution of the Senate, adopted on Saturday last, the 21st instant, the Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the reunion celebration at Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 2, 3, and 4, Mr. NEWLANDS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WORKS, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. DU PONT.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WORKS. I have received several telegrams from the Chamber of Commerce of Stockton, from grape growers and business men of Lodi, and from Chester H. Rowell, in my State,

relative to the proposed change in the tariff bill imposing a tax on spirits contained in California sweet wines. I ask that the telegrams be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRESNO, CAL., June 21, 1913.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Proposed change tariff bill imposing internal-revenue tax on spirits contained in California sweet wines would practically ruin the industry; would not produce more than small fraction of the revenue estimated, since little fortified wine would be produced. Sugar instead of alcohol would be added and the alcohol produced by complete fermentation of sugar in grapes in place of present incomplete fermentation; fortification of wines is primarily for purpose of increasing sugar rather than alcohol. Amendment is proposed primarily to give unfair advantage to sophisticated Ohio wines and to eastern alcoholic products used in patent medicines. Proposed tax would be staggering blow to Fresno grape industry already sufficiently menaced by decrease in raisin tariff and proposed reduction Zante currant tariff to 1 cent. Hope you can urge restoration of both wine and currant schedules to figures of House bill.

CHESTER H. ROWELL.

STOCKTON, CAL., June 21, 1913.

Senator JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.:

Grape growers appalled at magnitude of disaster threatened by repeal of sweet-wine law. Please do all in your power to impress upon Congress, and especially Finance Committee, that repeal of the sweet-wine law will add only a paltry sum to internal revenues; the imposition of tax of \$1.10 would be practically prohibitive, and while a little wine might be made and sold at very high prices, the bulk of our business would be lost and the Government would fail to get its revenue; would be impossible to compete with foreign wines fortified with free brandy. San Joaquin County has 40,000 acres of grapes affected by sweet-wine industry; tax would amount to \$25 per ton on grapes, which would be fatal to the industry. The sweet vineyards of this State have been planted under the belief that brandy would continue to be subject only to a very nominal tax necessary to reimburse Government for its cost of gauging. You can appreciate the situation, and insist upon at least a proper hearing being accorded by the Finance Committee to the grape growers of California.

STOCKTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By LOUIS S. WETMORE, President.
By JOHN P. IRISH, Jr., Acting Secretary.

LODI, CAL., June 21, 1913.

Senator JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our business men and grape growers were astonished at the action of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate in introducing a measure in the Underwood tariff bill providing for the repeal of the sweet-wine law, and feeling the vital interest which this community has in the sweet-wine industry of this State, a mass meeting of the grape growers of this district was called at our theater today. We were again astonished at the tremendous response to our call and the size and magnitude of the meeting. The grape growers here are very much excited, as they all realize the disaster that threatens them should the sweet-wine law be repealed. The following resolutions were passed unanimously with great enthusiasm at the mass meeting, and we have been requested to forward them to you by wire:

"Whereas there are in this district more than 15,000 acres of wine grapes devoted to the manufacturing of sweet wines; and
"Whereas there are in this district more than 15,000 acres of table grapes, a large part of which are used in the production of California sweet wines; and
"Whereas we were induced to engage in the business of growing both table and wine grapes, believing that our outlet through the manufacture of sweet wines was assured by the passage of the sweet-wine bill of 1890: Be it

"Resolved by the grape growers of Lodi and northern San Joaquin County in mass meeting assembled, That we protest against the great injury which will be done to this community if our present sweet-wine law is repealed. It takes many years to bring a vineyard into bearing, and our investments represent at least \$9,000,000. The revenue which will be derived by the United States Government is entirely overestimated in the Senate committee, because the amount of wine which would be produced under a tax of \$1.10 as proposed would be very small."

We sincerely hope that your efforts in this matter will accomplish something and that our industry here will be protected.

Very respectfully, yours,

GRAPE GROWERS AND BUSINESS MEN OF LODI,
By C. E. LAWRENCE, Chairman.

Mr. NELSON presented a resolution adopted by sundry citizens of Duluth, Minn., property owners in the Isle of Pines, the sovereignty over the Isle of Pines, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of the Audubon Society of Bridgeport, Conn.; Augusta M. Kennedy, of Whitman, Mass.; the California Associated Societies for the Conservation of Wild Life, of Berkeley, Cal.; the Wild Flower Club, of Concord, N. H.; the fish and game commissioners of Trenton, N. J.; the Board of Game Commissioners of Harrisburg, Pa.; E. H. Jewett, of Detroit, Mich.; and from Elsa Tudor de Pierrefeu, of Lakeside, Mich., praying for the adoption of the clause in Schedule N of the pending tariff bill, prohibiting the importation of the plumage of certain wild birds, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.